

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action dated September 29, 2004, and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office Action, the specification and claim 1 are rejected to for containing minor typographical errors. By the above amendments, the specification and claim 1 have been amended to correct the typographical errors in manners suggested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

Moreover, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Swanson. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson in view of Pechner. And claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson in view of Jacobi. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's claimed invention in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

According to MPEP 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Moreover, according to MPEP 2143.03, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

As the Examiner is aware, the claimed invention encompasses a main adjusting cavity and a sub-adjusting cavity defined in a cylinder. Swanson does not

teach or suggest a main adjusting cavity and a sub-adjusting cavity defined in a cylinder, as required by claim 1. More specifically, the main adjusting cavity of the claimed invention is defined in the outer surface of the cylinder, and communicates with the main adjusting hole in the cylinder extending along a first rotating direction of the cylinder. The sub-adjusting cavity of this invention is defined in the outer surface of the cylinder, and communicates with the sub-adjusting hole in the cylinder, and extends along the second direction opposite the first rotating direction. Therefore, the main and sub-adjusting cavities extend respectively in opposite rotating directions of the cylinder, and communicate with different adjusting holes in the cylinder, respectively.

This arrangement of the opposing directional adjusting cavities in the cylinder allows for a pin block to enter the corresponding adjusting cavity when the cylinder is rotated. The cylinder can be rotated uni-directionally relative to the housing with a specific key even when a pin block is blocking the rotating interface of the cylinder and the housing.

Moreover, the recesses 26 in the cylinder 22 of the Swanson reference do not extend in different rotating directions of the cylinder. Each recess 26 in the cylinder 22 is only a dimple defined in the outer surface of the cylinder 22 and selectively aligns with one of the barrel holes in the barrel 21. The recesses 25 of the Swanson reference cannot hold the pin 37 that blocks the rotating interface of the cylinder and the barrel when the cylinder is rotated. Moreover, the lock of the Swanson reference cannot control the cylinder to be rotated in different directions by different keys. Therefore, the structure and function of the recesses 26 of the

Swanson reference are essentially different from those of the adjusting cavities of the claimed invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Neither Pechner nor Jacobi, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests the shortcomings of the Swanson reference, namely, the main and sub-adjusting cavities.

Claims 2-12 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the reasons provided in connection with claim 1.

The prior art references made of record by the Examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the claims as amended. It is noted that none of these references have been specifically applied by the Examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated September 29, 2004, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance.

Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16